UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,056	12/12/2001	Paul N. Weinberg	05711.915	5658

36067 7590 09/20/2005

DALINA LAW GROUP, P.C.
7910 IVANHOE AVE. #325
LA JOLLA, CA 92037

EXAMINER	
CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TH

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/022,056	WEINBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mellissa M. Chojnacki	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *91-180* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *91-180* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on December 3, 2004 claims 1-90 have been cancelled and new claims 91-180 are added per applicant's request. Therefore, claims 91-180 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 91-93, 95-134 and 143-180 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wotring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677) in view of Bliss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,938).

As to claim 91, Wotring et al. teaches a computer program product (See abstract; column 2, lines 49-51) comprising:

obtain a source data structure comprising a set of source tables (See column 2, lines 14-23), a set of source fields (See column 2, lines 54-60), a set of source records (See column 4, lines 10-15), a set of source table relationships (See column 2, lines 14-23), and a set of source values (See column 4, lines 35-44);

obtain transformation data comprising information associated with at least one of the set of source tables, the set of source fields, the set of source records, the set of source table relationships, and the set of source values (See column 1, lines 50-57; column 2, lines 14-23, lines 54-60; column 4, lines 10-15, lines 35-44; column 5, lines 39-45);

apply the transformation data to all or some of the set of source tables, the set of source fields, the set of source records, the set of source table relationships, or the set of source values (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 2, lines 14-23);

Wotring et al. does not teach a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into a destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-18; column 3, lines 34-39), the computer program configured to:

process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields (See abstract; column 3, lines 13-24; column 4, lines 5-14); transform the source data structure into a destination data structure (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into a destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into a destination data structure would efficiently transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

As to claim 92, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination data structure comprises a database (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 50-54, where "destination data structure" is read on "Hierarchical database"; column 2, lines 52-60).

As to claim 93, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the database comprises catalog data (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 4-7, where "catalog" is read on "indexing", also see lines 28-30).

As to claim 95, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises mapping information and the computer program is configured to use the mapping information to execute a means for mapping the source data structure to the destination data structure (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-54; column 3, lines 21-22, lines 49-57; column 4, lines 10-16, where "source data structure" is read on "Relational Database" and "destination data structure" is read on "hierarchical database").

As to claim 96, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the mapping information is displayed to the user (See Bliss et al., column 15, lines 11-29; column 25, lines 30-34).

As to claim 97, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the mapping information comprises field-level mapping information that identifies a correlation between at least one of the set of source fields and at least one destination field (See (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 98, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the field-level mapping information is displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 15, lines 11-29; column 25, lines 30-34).

As to claim 99, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one of the set of source fields in the field-level mapping comprises a source field combination having a plurality of source fields (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-36; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 100, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source field combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 101, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one destination field in the field-level mapping information comprises a destination field combination having a plurality of destination fields (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claims 102, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination field combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 103, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one of the set of source fields in the field-level mapping information comprises a source field

combination having a plurality of source fields and the at least one destination field in the field-level mapping comprises a destination field combination having a plurality of destination fields (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-36; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 104, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source field combinations and the destination field combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58; column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 105, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the mapping information comprises value-level mapping information that identifies a correlation between at least one of the set of source values of the at least one of the set of source fields and at least one of the set of destination values of the at least one destination field (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-25, lines 35-38).

As to claim 106, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the value-level mapping information is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-17).

As to claim 107, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one of the set of source values in the value-level mapping comprises a source value combination having the set of source values of a plurality of the at least one of the set of source fields associated with a set of destination values of the at least one of the

destination fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-25, lines 35-38; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-36; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 108, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 109, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the value-level mapping comprises a destination value combination having a plurality of the set of destination values of the at least one of the destination fields associated with a plurality of the set of source values of the at least one of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16, lines 39-60; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 110, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination value combinations are displayed to user (See Bliss et al., column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 111, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of source values of the at least one of the set of source fields in the value-Level mapping comprises a source value combination having values of a plurality of the at least one of the set of source fields and the destination values of the at least one of the destination fields in the value-level mapping comprises a destination value combination having a

plurality of the at least one of the destination fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16, lines 39-60; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 112, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value combinations and the destination value combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58; column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 113, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises type information and the computer program comprises a means for converting the set of source fields from a source type to a destination type based on the type information (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 114, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the type information is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 115, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises type information for converting the set of source fields from a source type to a destination type based on the type information (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 116, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to merge the set of source values of the set of source fields into source value combinations comprising a plurality of source values and convert the source value combinations into destination fields of the destination data structure (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9; column 9, lines 5-17; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 4-14).

As to claim 117, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 118, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate hierarchy among the set of source values of the set of source fields into source value hierarchies comprising a plurality of source values and convert the source value hierarchies into destination fields of the destination data structure (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38; also see Bliss et al., column 6, lines 39-43).

As to claim 119, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value hierarchies are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38).

As to claim 120, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data is generated automatically (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 13-18; also see Bliss et al., column 6, lines 39-43).

As to claim 121, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises parsing information and the computer program is configured to execute a means for parsing data values from descriptive fields (See Bliss et al., column 28, lines 60-64).

As to claim 122, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure comprises descriptive fields having data values and the computer program is configured to use the transformation data to extract the data values from the descriptive fields (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38;column 10, lines 31-38, lines 49-57).

As to claim 123, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one added source field in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 10, lines 49-57).

As to claim 124, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the added source field is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 10, lines 49-57).

As to claims 125-127, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one cloned source field containing a copy of the set of source values in one of the set of source fields in accordance with the transformation data (See Bliss et al., abstract; column 4, lines 53-56); wherein the at least one cloned source field is displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 14, lines 33-37); wherein the values of the at least one cloned source field is displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 14, lines 33-37).

As to claim 128, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one split-into-hierarchy source field containing a hierarchy based on the set of source values in one of the set of source fields in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55; column 5, lines 39-56).

As to claim 129, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one split-into hierarchy source field is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55; column 5, lines 39-62; column 8, lines 57-60).

As to claim 130, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of source values of the split-into-hierarchy source field are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55; column 5, lines 39-62; column 8, lines 57-60).

As to claim 131, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one plurality of split-into-multiple source fields each containing components of the set of source values in one of the set of source fields in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55).

As to claim 132, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the plurality of split-into multiple source fields are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 8, lines 57-60).

As to claim 133, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of source values of the plurality of split-into-multiple source fields are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16).

As to claim 134, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to extract data values from descriptive fields by identifying the data values within the descriptive fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16), parsing the data values from the descriptive fields (See Bliss et al., column 28, lines 60-64), and populating the at least one new source field with the data values (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14).

As to claim 143, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure comprises a plurality of joined data sources (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-48; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 144, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises matching information and the computer program is configured to use the matching information to execute a means for matching the set of source records to the destination records (See Bliss et al., column 3, lines 3-5; column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 145, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information comprises record-level information identifying the correlation between at least one of the set of source records and at least one of the destination records (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 146, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 147, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information indicates a new destination record is to be created with at least one of the

set of source values from one of the set of source fields from one of the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 148, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information indicates at least one of the destination fields in at least one of the destination records is to be updated with at least one of the set of source values from one of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 149, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information indicates at least one destination record is to be replaced with at least one of the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 3, lines 45-52).

As to claim 150, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is further configured to transform the set of source values in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61).

As to claim 151, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformed set of source values are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; also see Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 152, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program comprises an integrated interface for obtaining the transformation data (See Bliss et al., column 9, lines 34-51; column 10, lines 43-48).

As to claim 153, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure is represented within the integrated interface as a hierarchy (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 154, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the set of source tables (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 155, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 156, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the source table relationships (Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 157, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein a user can define additional relationships between the set of source tables (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 158, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the source data values (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23; column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38).

As to claim 159, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination data structure is represented within the integrated interface as a hierarchy (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 160, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination tables (Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23; column 5, lines 39-56).

As to claim 161, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination fields (Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23, lines 25-48).

As to claim 162, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination table relationships (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 163, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination data values (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23; column 4, lines 47-55).

As to claim 164, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program comprises a means for handling exceptions a source field at a time (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 66-67; column 20, lines 1-4; column28, lines 64-67; column 29, lines 1-2).

As to claim 165, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to collapse the set of source values within the set of source records down to a set of distinct values within the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 166, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of distinct values is configured to act as a proxy for the set of source values (See Wotring et al.,

column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 167, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein each distinct value within the set of distinct values is configured to act as a proxy for all instances of the distinct value across the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 168, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data is applied to the set of distinct values (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; column 5, lines 39-53; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 169, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data is applied once to each distinct value rather than once for each instance of the distinct value, and is automatically propagated to each instance of the distinct value (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 170, Wotring et al. teaches a computer program product (See abstract; column 2, lines 49-51):

obtain the source data structure (See column 2, lines 14-23);

obtain transformation data comprising information associated with the source data structure (column 1, lines 50-57; column 2, lines 14-23, lines 54-60; column 4, lines 10-15, lines 35-44; column 5, lines 39-45);

collapse the set of source values within the set of source records down to a set of distinct values within the set of source records (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46);

apply the transformation data to the set of distinct values (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55; column 5, lines 39-53).

Wotring et al. does not teach a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a computer-usable medium having a computer (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-18; column 3, lines 34-39), program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12), the computer program configured to: comprising: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields (See abstract; column 3, lines 13-24;

column 4, lines 5-14); transform the source data structure into the destination data structure(See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into the destination data structure would efficiently transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

As to claim 171, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure comprises a structured document (See Bliss et al., column 10, lines 12-20).

As to claim 172, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination data structure comprises a structured document (See Bliss et al., column 10, lines 12-15, lines 24-27).

As to claim 173, Wotring et al. teaches an apparatus for transforming data (See abstract) comprising:

a first region comprising a source hierarchy representing a source data structure (See column 2, lines 14-23);

a second region comprising a destination hierarchy representing a destination data structure (See column 2, lines 52-55; column 5, lines 39-53).

Wotring et al. does not teach a processor; a memory medium coupled to the processor; the memory medium containing a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface comprising: the computer program configured to access the first region and process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields associated with the data structure; a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a processor (See column 7, lines 17-21); a memory medium coupled to the processor (See column 7, lines 17-21, lines 66-67; column 8, lines 1-2); the memory medium containing a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface

(See column 7, lines 17-21) comprising: the computer program configured to access the first region and process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields associated with the data structure (See abstract; column 3, lines 13-24; column 4, lines 5-14); a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a processor; a memory medium coupled to the processor; the memory medium containing a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface comprising: the computer program configured to access the first region and process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields associated with the data structure; a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a processor; a memory medium coupled to the processor; the memory medium containing a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface comprising: the computer program configured to access the first region and process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields associated with the data structure; a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure would efficiently

transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

As to claim 174, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises partitioning information (See Wotring et al., column 6, lines 40-47).

As to claim 175, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises field-level mapping information (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-54; column 3, lines 21-22, lines 49-57; column 4, lines 10-16; also see Bliss et al., column 15, lines 11-29; column 25, lines 30-34).

As to claim 176, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises value-level mapping information (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-54; column 3, lines 21-22, lines 49-57; column 4, lines 10-16; column 9, lines 5-16).

As to claim 177, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises matching information (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 178, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises type conversion information (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 35-38).

As to claim 179, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises parsing information (See Bliss et al., column 28, lines 60-64).

As to claim 180, Wotring et al. teaches a computer program product (See abstract; column 2, lines 49-51):

obtain the source data structure (See column 2, lines 14-23);

obtain transformation data comprising information associated with the source data structure (column 1, lines 50-57; column 2, lines 14-23, lines 54-60; column 4, lines 10-15, lines 35-44; column 5, lines 39-45);

collapse the set of source values within the set of source records down to a set of distinct values within the set of source records (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46);

wherein each distinct value within the set of distinct values is configured to act as a proxy for instances of the distinct value across the set of source records (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary");

apply the transformation data to the set of distinct values (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55; column 5, lines 39-53).

Wotring et al. does not teach a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-

at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a computer-usable medium having a computer (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-18; column 3, lines 34-39), program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12), the computer program configured to: comprising: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields (See abstract; column 3, lines 13-24; column 4, lines 5-14); transform the source data structure into the destination data structure(See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: process the source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of

the set of source fields; transform the source data structure into the destination data structure would efficiently transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

4. Claims 94 and 135-142 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wotring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677) in view of Bliss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,938), as applied to claim 1, 3-44 and 53-90 above, and further in view of Mehr et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,658).

As to claim 94, Wotring et al. as modified, still does not teach wherein the database comprises financial data.

Mehr et al. teaches a computer system and method for managing sales information (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the database comprises financial data (See column 1, lines 16-21, where "financial data" is read on "financing plans"; also see column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, to include wherein the database comprises financial data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, by the teachings of Mehr et al. because wherein the database comprises financial data would prevent

creating redundant data, thus preventing unnecessary use of data storage resources (See Mehr et al., column 1, lines 29-35).

As to claim 135, Wotring et al. as modified, still does not teach wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields.

Mehr et al. teaches a computer system and method for managing sales information (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields (See column 13, lines 37-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, to include wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, by the teachings of Mehr et al. because wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields would enable

corporations to store vast amounts of product information in a system (See Mehr et al., column 1, lines 15-25).

As to claim 136, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the measurement information is displayed to a user (See Mehr et al., column 10, lines 27-31; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 137, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the means for normalizing further comprises combining numeric value and the unit of measure from a plurality of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 57-61; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 138, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein at least one of the set of source values within the set of source fields comprises an improperly formed measurement value comprising a numeric value and a unit of measure (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 139, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the unit of measure comprises an implicit unit of measure associated with the set of source values (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 140, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the unit of measure comprises inconsistent string values (See Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 141, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the units of measure differ within a plurality of the values within each of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 142, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein computer program is further configured to append the unit of measure to set of source values missing the unit of measure (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 03-December -2004, with respect to the rejected claims 91-180 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments regarding Bliss et al. does not teach "process said source data structure by field-at-a-time handling of said set of source field", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive,

because Bliss et al. discloses loading data from one source field into corresponding destination field and repeating the process for each other field (See abstract; column 3, lines 14-24; column 4, lines 5-14). This process does disclose handling one field at a time as disclosed in claim 91. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, in the amendment the applicant discloses a blanket assertion in regards to the argument, by stating that Bliss et al. does not teach "field-at-a-time" but applicant does not assert why he believes Bliss et al. does not teach this feature.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 14, 2005
Mmc

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER